

**UNIVERZITA KARLOVA**  
**Fakulta sociálních věd**  
**Institut mezinárodních studií**

**PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE**  
**(Posudek oponenta)**

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Anna Jírová

Název práce: Seal Hunting in the Canadian Arctic: Conflicting Perspectives on EU Regulation  
1007/2009

---

Oponoval (u externích oponentů uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): Lucie Kýrová, MA, Ph.D.

1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle):

The topic of Ms. Jírová's thesis is the European Union ban on seal products from 2009, the campaigns that lead to it, and its impact on Inuit communities. The author approaches the topic from a cultural perspective and a theoretical framework of Coloniality of Power, examining important actors and their arguments and debates that lead to the policy – the European Union, the Canadian government, animal welfare NGOs, and Inuit activists and hunters. The aim of the work is to test the hypothesis that the discourse surrounding the European Seal ban of 2009 was dominated by a colonial mindset (that does not afford the same level of seriousness to Indigenous views) and that a true decolonization of the Western mind has not been achieved yet.

2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.):

The selected topic is a challenging one, requiring an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on disciplines such as history, international relations and law, or Indigenous studies. The author's use of the theoretical concept of Coloniality / Coloniality of Power demonstrates her knowledge of current academic debates within Indigenous studies and allows her to examine the topic from a more complex angle of post-colonial power relations. The thesis is structured logically, taking the reader from a theoretical framework to the introduction of the main actors to a detailed discussion of the campaigns and reasons behind the European Seal ban and the eventual Inuit exception in it. The author clearly explains the theoretical concept and its application in the first part of the thesis, before proceeding to the details of her case study. The arguments and analyses are based on a wide range of primary sources, allowing to present the major actors in the conflict in their own words, and secondary literature.

3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.):

The thesis is written in an excellent English without any unnecessary typos and with usually consistent spelling and capitalization (with very few exceptions, for example on p. 8 and 56 of inconsistent spelling of "I/indigenous"). The author uses and quotes her sources appropriately, using correct citation format. Graphical organization of the thesis is well done, with clear indication of each chapter and sub-chapters. The author could have indented her paragraphs though to make orientation in the text easier.

4. STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE (celkový dojem z diplomové práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):

Overall, this is a very well written thesis that shows a serious research and approach to the topic by the author. The work demonstrates a clear attempt at a balanced portrayal of the main actors, their arguments, goals and tactics, through the use of primary sources that allow for inclusion of the actors' own voices. This comes as a no surprise as I had Ms. Jírová in my Thesis seminar III and was able to

observe (and discuss) her evaluation and analyses of her sources and her careful consideration of each of the main actors' arguments and positions on the issue. Though in her section 3.4 "Providing a Counter-Argument," the author could have provided a deeper analysis of the strategies and rhetoric of the Canadian government and the Inuit – the counter-argument to the animal welfare NGOs. As it is, the section is still dominantly focused on the NGOs themselves. I would have also appreciate a better cohesion between the theoretical chapter (1) and the case study itself (specifically chapter 4). While the discussion of the issue, its main actors, and their strategies and rhetoric implicitly point to continued coloniality and hierarchy of knowledge and political power, an explicit analysis about those connections within the chapters themselves (not just in the conclusion) would have linked the chapters together and demonstrated the thesis central argument more clearly. However, the author has proved her arguments with ample evidence.

#### 5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):

On p. 42 you mention Greenpeace's new attitude toward seal hunting and their attempt to re-establish a working relation with Inuit. On pp. 51-52 you also discuss the organization's opposition to oil exploration and drilling in the Arctic, which was authorized by the Inuit themselves. How do you explain this difference? Is it a question of the nature of the enterprises (hunting v. oil drilling) and their impact on the environment only? Or do you think perceptions of "modernity" and intellectual coloniality / coloniality of power play a role in the organization's attitude as well?

You briefly mentioned the *UNDRIP* in your work. Even though many EU members signed the *Declaration*, the document did not seem to play any role in the debates and eventual passage of the Seal ban. Can you explain the legal role of the *Declaration* and its limitations vis-à-vis the EU and its regulations?

The situation surrounding the Seal ban and its Inuit exception sounds like a Catch 22. Is there a way out? In other words, if there were to be renewed debates about seal hunt and seal products, what would be your recommendations, based on your research and knowledge of the issues?

#### 6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA (A a B výborně, C a D velmi dobře, E dobře, F nevyhověl):

I recommend this thesis for defense and propose a mark B or A, depending on the defense.

Datum:

Podpis:

---

Pozn.: Hodnocení pište k jednotlivým bodům, pokud nepíšete v textovém editoru, použijte při nedostatku místa zadní stranu nebo příložený list. V hodnocení práce se pokuste oddělit ty její nedostatky, které jsou, podle vašeho mínění, obhajobou neodstranitelné (např. chybí kritické zhodnocení pramenů a literatury), od těch věcí, které student může dobrou obhajobou napravit; poměr těchto dvou položek berte prosím v úvahu při stanovení konečné známky.